arXiv:1701.05961v1 [math.CO] 21 Jan 2017

Approximations of the Domination Number of a Graph

Glenn G. Chappell
Department of Computer Science
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, AK 99775-6670
chappellg@member.ams.org

John Gimbel
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, AK 99775-6660
jggimbel@alaska.edu

Chris Hartman
Department of Computer Science
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, AK 99775-6670
cmhartman@alaska.edu

January 17, 2017

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C69 (primary), 05C80 (secondary).
Key words and phrases. domination, fractional domination, greedy domination, random graphs.

Abstract

Given a graph G, the domination number $\gamma(G)$ of G is the minimum order of a set S of vertices such that each vertex not in S is adjacent to some vertex in S. Equivalently, label the vertices from $\{0, 1\}$ so that the sum over each closed neighborhood is at least one; the minimum value of the sum of all labels, with this restriction, is the domination number. The fractional domination number $\gamma_f(G)$ is defined in the same way, except that the vertex labels are chosen from $[0, 1]$. Given an ordering of the vertex set of G, let $\gamma_g(G)$ be the approximation of the domination number by the standard greedy algorithm. Computing the domination number is NP-complete; however, we can bound γ by these two more easily computed parameters:

$$\gamma_f(G) \le \gamma(G) \le \gamma_g(G).$$

How good are these approximations? Using techniques from the theory of hypergraphs, one can show that, for every graph G of order n,

$$\frac{\gamma_g(G)}{\gamma_f(G)} = O(\log n).$$

On the other hand, we provide examples of graphs for which $\gamma/\gamma_f = \Theta(\log n)$ and graphs for which $\gamma_g/\gamma = \Theta(\log n)$. Lastly, we use our examples to compare two bounds on γ_g.

Graphs will be finite, simple, and undirected. For a graph G, we denote by $\delta(G)$ and $\Delta(G)$ the minimum and maximum degree of G, respectively. We use $N[v]$ to denote the closed neighborhood of a vertex v. The closed neighborhood of a sequence of vertices, e.g., $N[v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k]$, is the union of the closed neighborhoods of the vertices in the sequence. We say that vertex v *dominates* vertex u if u lies in the closed neighborhood of v. See Haynes, Hedetniemi, & Slater [8] for definitions of graph-theoretic terms and an introduction to domination in graphs.

If we assign weights to the vertices of a graph, then the *total weight* of a set of vertices is the sum of the weights of the vertices in the set. We may consider a dominating set as a $0,1$-weighting of the vertex set so that the total weight of each closed neighborhood is at least one. Relaxing the requirement that the weights be integers, we obtain a fractional version of the domination number. Suppose we assign weight $f(v) \in [0,1]$ to each vertex v. The function $f\colon V(G) \to [0,1]$ is a *fractional domination* if for each vertex v,

$$\sum_{u \in N[v]} f(u) \geq 1.$$

The *fractional domination number* $\gamma_f(G)$ of G is the minimum total weight of the vertex set, taken over all fractional dominations of G.

A useful bound is the following, which was discovered independently by Grinstead & Slater [7, Theorem 1] and by Domke, Hedetniemi, & Laskar [5, Observation 3] (Observation 3 in the latter paper is slightly misstated, with the inequalities in the wrong direction, but the proof is correct).

Lemma 1. *For a graph G of order n,*

$$\frac{n}{1+\Delta(G)} \leq \gamma_f(G) \leq \frac{n}{1+\delta(G)}. \quad \square$$

Throughout this paper, we will implicitly assume an ordering on the vertex set of a graph. Given such an ordering, we can approximate the domination number using a greedy algorithm, as follows. Iteratively select vertices $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$ so that, for each $k = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, vertex x_k is chosen so that it dominates as many vertices of $V(G) - N[x_1, x_2, ..., x_{k-1}]$ (that is, not-yet-dominated vertices) as possible. Resolve ties by choosing x_k as early as possible in the ordering on $V(G)$. Stop the iterative process when every vertex is dominated by one of the x_k's. We refer to $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$ as the *greedy dominating sequence*. The *greedy domination number* $\gamma_g(G) = m$ is the number of vertices in this sequence.

Determining the domination number of a general graph is known to be NP-complete (see Garey & Johnson [6]); it is natural to seek more easily computed approximations. The values of γ_f and γ_g can be determined in polynomial time. Further, the fact that γ lies in the interval $[\gamma_f, \gamma_g]$ follows easily from definitions.

Observation 2. *For every graph G,*

$$\gamma_f(G) \le \gamma(G) \le \gamma_g(G). \quad \square$$

We study the relationships of these three parameters further.

Techniques from the theory of hypergraphs can be used to show that the ratio $\gamma_g(G)/\gamma_f(G)$ is $O(\log \Delta)$, and thus $O(\log n)$, where n is the order of G; see Theorem 4, below. Thus $\gamma(G)$ must lie within a relatively small interval. We produce examples showing that, asymptotically, we can do no better. We show that $\gamma(G)/\gamma_f(G)$ can be $\Theta(\log n)$, and then we show that $\gamma_g(G)/\gamma(G)$ can be $\Theta(\log n)$.

Since γ_g is a useful upper bound on γ, it is worthwhile to consider upper bounds on γ_g. One such bound follows immediately from the above discussion:

$$\gamma_g(G) \le c\gamma_f(G) \log n,$$

for some constant c, where n is the order of G. Another class of bounds are those in which γ_g is bounded above by a constant multiple of $(n \log \delta)/\delta$. The first of these was found by Alon & Spencer [1] (see their Theorem 2.2 and the remarks following it). A slightly improved bound was given by Clark, Shekhtman, Suen, & Fisher [4, Theorem 2]; we state this below.

Theorem 3 (Clark, Shekhtman, Suen, & Fisher [4])**.** *For every graph G of order n,*

$$\gamma_g(G) \le n \left[1 - \prod_{i=1}^{\delta+1} \frac{i\delta}{i\delta + 1} \right],$$

where $\delta = \delta(G)$. $\square$

We note that the right side of the above inequality is $\Theta\big([n \log \delta]/\delta\big)$. At the conclusion of this paper, we will compare these two bounds on γ_g, using examples to show that sometimes one is tighter, and sometimes the other is.

In the following result, we will use a concept dual to fractional domination. A function $f\colon V(G) \to [0,1]$ is a *fractional packing* if for each vertex v,

$$\sum_{u \in N[v]} f(u) \le 1.$$

Note that the maximum total weight of $V(G)$, taken over all fractional packings, and the minimum total weight of $V(G)$, taken over all fractional dominations, are described by dual linear programs (see Haynes, Hedetniemi, & Slater [8, Chapter 4] or Domke, Hedetniemi, & Laskar [5, Section 3]). Thus, by the principle of strong duality, given a fractional packing on a graph G, the total weight of the vertex set is at most $\gamma_f(G)$.

We now prove an upper bound on $\gamma_g(G)/\gamma_f(G)$. This is a special case of a more general result on vertex covers of hypergraphs and is similar to a bound found by Johnson [9, Theorem 4] and by Lovász [10, Corollary 2] (see also Schrijver [13, Theorem 77.2]).

Theorem 4. *For every graph G,*

$$\frac{\gamma_g(G)}{\gamma_f(G)} \leq 1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big].$$

Proof. Set $m = \gamma_g(G)$. Let $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$ be the greedy dominating sequence. For each vertex v of G, let $g(v)$ be the first vertex in the greedy dominating sequence that dominates v. Let $F(v)$ be the set of all vertices of G that are first dominated by $g(v)$; that is, $F(v) = N[x_k] - N[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-1}]$, where $x_k = g(v)$. Let $w(v) = \frac{1}{|F(v)|}$. So $w(v)$ is the reciprocal of the number of vertices that are dominated in the same step of the greedy algorithm as v. Note that $\sum_{u \in F(v)} w(u) = 1$, and thus $\sum_{v \in V(G)} w(v) = m$.

Our proof is based on that of Schrijver [13, Theorem 77.2], and proceeds as follows. We assign weight $w(v)$ to each vertex v. We find upper bounds on the weights of vertices lying in a closed neighborhood, and conclude that, if each vertex v is given weight $w(v)/\big(1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big]\big)$, then the result is a fractional packing. Applying linear programming duality, we then obtain a lower bound on $\gamma_f(G)$, from which our result follows.

Let v be a vertex of G. We list the elements of $N[v]$ in the order in which they were dominated in the greedy algorithm. Letting $p = 1 + \deg(v)$, we represent $N[v]$ as $\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p\}$, where, if $g(u_i)$ comes before $g(u_j)$ in the greedy dominating sequence, then $i < j$.

We claim that $w(u_i) \leq \frac{1}{p+1-i}$ for each u_i. Suppose for a contradiction that $|F(u_i)| < p + 1 - i$, for some u_i. Then $|F(u_i)| < \big|\{u_i, u_{i+1}, \ldots, u_p\}\big|$, and so replacing $g(u_i)$ by v in the greedy dominating sequence would increase the number of vertices dominated at this step in the greedy algorithm. However, this contradicts the definition of greedy dominating sequence, and so $|F(u_i)| \geq p + 1 - i$. Thus,

$$w(u_i) = \frac{1}{|F(u_i)|} \leq \frac{1}{p+1-i},$$

as claimed.

Hence, for each vertex v we have

$$\sum_{u \in N[v]} w(u) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{1}{p+1-i} = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{1}{i} \leq 1 + \ln p \leq 1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big].$$

Dividing by $1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big]$, we obtain

$$\sum_{u \in N[v]} \frac{w(u)}{1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big]} \leq 1,$$

and so assigning weight $w(v)/\big(1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big]\big)$ to each vertex v, results in a fractional packing. Therefore, as noted before the statement of the theorem, the sum of all vertex weights is bounded above by $\gamma_f(G)$. That is,

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{w(v)}{1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big]} \leq \gamma_f(G).$$

Multiplying by $1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big]$, we obtain

$$\gamma_g(G) = m = \sum_{v \in V(G)} w(v) \leq \big(1 + \ln\big[1 + \Delta(G)\big]\big)\, \gamma_f(G).$$

Dividing by $\gamma_f(G)$ yields our result. $\square$

Hence the following.

Corollary 5. *For any graph G of order n with maximum degree $\Delta \geq 2$*

$$\gamma(G) \leq c_1 \ln(\Delta) \gamma_f(G)$$

and

$$\gamma(G) \leq c_2 \ln(n) \gamma_f(G),$$

where c_1 and c_2 are appropriately chosen constants. $\square$

The preceding theorem and corollary place restrictions on the value of γ. We now show that these restrictions are asymptotically best possible up to a constant factor. We begin with a construction of a family of graphs in which γ lies near the high end of the interval $[\gamma_f, \gamma_g]$. Later, we will obtain better results using random graphs.

Example 6. Given a positive integer t, we construct a graph J_t of order $n = (2t)^{2t-1}$ such that

$$\gamma_f(J_t) = e + o(1) = \Theta(1)$$

and

$$\gamma(J_t) = 2t = \Theta\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right).$$

Let t be a positive integer. Set $d = 2t - 1$ and $n = (2t)^d$. Let G be the graph $K_{2t} - tK_2$, that is, K_{2t} with a perfect matching removed. Let J_t be the graph whose vertices are d-tuples of the form $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d)$ where each x_i is a vertex in G. Let vertices $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d)$ and $(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_d)$ be adjacent in J_t if for each i, the vertices x_i and y_i are equal or adjacent in G. (The way in which J_t is constructed from G is often called the "strong [direct] product".) We note that J_t has order n.

We show that J_t has the required properties. For each vertex v of G, denote by $\overline{v}$ the unique vertex in G that is not adjacent to v.

Note that J_t is regular of degree $(2t-1)^d - 1$. By Lemma 1,

$$\gamma_f(J_t) = \frac{n}{(2t-1)^d} = \frac{(d+1)^d}{d^d} = e + o(1).$$

Let S be a set of d vertices of J_t. We write $S = \big\{\, (x_1^i, x_2^i, \ldots, x_d^i) \;\big|\; i = 1, 2, \ldots, d \,\big\}$. Let $u = \left(\overline{x_1^1}, \overline{x_2^2}, \ldots, \overline{x_d^d}\right)$. Then u is not dominated by any vertex in S, so S is not a dominating set. Hence, the domination number of J_t is at least $d + 1$. Now let A be the set of all vertices in J_t of the form $(v, v, v, \ldots, v)$ where v is a vertex in G. Since there are $d+1$ such vertices, but only d coordinates, every vertex of J_t must be dominated by at least one vertex of A. Thus, A is a dominating set of size $d + 1$, and so $\gamma(J) = d + 1 = 2t$. $\square$

For the graph J_t of Example 6, $\gamma/\gamma_f = \Theta(\log n/\log\log n)$. Thus we have constructed an infinite family of graphs for which the ratio γ/γ_f is unbounded. However, the ratio is not as high as we would like. Using random graphs, we can produce better examples, for which γ/γ_f is, with high probability, $\Theta(\log n)$.

For each natural number n, let R_n be a random graph on n labeled vertices with edge probability $1/2$. Given a graphical property P we say that R_n *almost surely* (a.s.) has P if the probability that R_n has P goes to one as n approaches infinity. See Palmer [12] for an introduction to random graphs.

It is known that the domination number of R_n is almost surely $\Theta(\log n)$ (see Nikoletseas & Spirakis [11, Lemmas 1 & 2]). In fact, much stronger results are known. Weber [14, Theorem 2] showed that $\gamma(R_n)$ is a.s. equal to one of two values given by explicit formulae. For our purposes, it suffices that $\gamma(R_n)$ is a.s. $\Theta(\log n)$. On the other hand, $\gamma_f(R_n)$ is a.s. $\Theta(1)$. We give a short proof of these facts below.

Theorem 7. *Almost surely,*

$$\gamma_f(R_n) = 2 + o(1)$$

and

$$\gamma(R_n) = \Theta(\log n).$$

Proof. It is known that the degrees of all vertices in R_n tend to concentrate tightly around $n/2$. In particular, a.s.

$$\big[1 - o(1)\big]\frac{n}{2} \le \delta(R_n) \le \Delta(R_n) \le \big[1 + o(1)\big]\frac{n}{2}.$$

This follows from a Chernoff bound [3, Theorem 1]; for a proof, see Palmer [12, Theorem 5.1.4]. Applying Lemma 1, we conclude that a.s. $\gamma_f(R_n) = 2 + o(1)$.

Since $\gamma_f(R_n)$ is a.s. $\Theta(1)$, by Corollary 5 we see that $\gamma(R_n)$ is a.s. $O(\log n)$. It remains to show that $\gamma(R_n)$ is a.s. $\Omega(\log n)$. Fix ε with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Set $p = \big\lfloor (1-\varepsilon)\log_2 n \big\rfloor$. We show that a.s. $\gamma(R_n) > p$, which will complete our proof.

Our argument is similar to that given by Nikoletseas & Spirakis [11, Lemma 1]. Let S be a subset of $V(G)$ with order p. If v is a vertex not in S then the probability that S dominates v is $1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^p$. Hence, the probability that S dominates R_n is $\left[1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^p\right]^{n-p}$. Let E be the expected number of p-sets that dominate R_n. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
E = \binom{n}{p}\left[1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^p\right]^{n-p} &\le n^p\left[e^{-(1/2)^p}\right]^{n-p} \\
&\le n^p e^{-\left(1/n^{1-\varepsilon}\right)(n-p)} \qquad \text{since } 2^p \le n^{1-\varepsilon} \\
&= e^{p\ln(n) - \left(n/n^{1-\varepsilon}\right)} e^{p/n^{1-\varepsilon}} \\
&\le c e^{p\ln(n) - n^{\varepsilon}},
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant c. But the last expression goes to zero as n approaches infinity. Hence, R_n a.s. has no dominating p-set. This leads to the desired result. □

When the random graph R_n almost surely has some property, we may conclude that, for each sufficiently large n, there exists a graph of order n having the property. Hence, we obtain the following.

Corollary 8. *There exist graphs G_n, for infinitely many integers n, so that each G_n has order n, and*

$$\frac{\gamma(G_n)}{\gamma_f(G_n)} = \Theta(\log n). \quad \square$$

Thus, the bounds in Corollary 5 are asymptotically best possible. We have proven this using probabilistic methods. The best explicit construction we have been able to find is that of the graphs J_t from Example 6, for which the ratio γ/γ_f is smaller: $\Theta(\log n/\log\log n)$. We ask whether an explicit construction can be found for the larger ratio.

Problem 9. *Find an explicit construction of graphs G_n, for infinitely many integers n, so that each G_n has order n, and*

$$\frac{\gamma(G_n)}{\gamma_f(G_n)} = \Theta\left(\log n\right). \quad \square$$

We have seen that γ_g/γ_f is $O(\log n)$, and that the ratio γ/γ_f may be $\Theta(\log n)$. In our next example the ratio γ_g/γ is $\Theta(\log n)$. Thus, γ is near the low end of the interval $[\gamma_f, \gamma_g]$, and the greedy algorithm approximates the domination number relatively poorly.

Example 10. Given an integer $t \geq 4$, we construct a graph H_t of order $n = 2^{t+2}$ such that

$$\gamma_f(H_t) = \gamma(H_t) = 4$$

and

$$\gamma_g(H_t) = t = \Theta(\log n).$$

Let $t \geq 4$ be a natural number. Let u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 be vertices and set $S = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$. To construct H_t, begin with the union of S and t disjoint cliques:

$$S \cup \left[K_4 \cup K_8 \cup K_{16} \cup \cdots \cup K_{2\cdot 2^t}\right].$$

Add additional edges so that each vertex of S is adjacent to one quarter of the vertices in each clique, and no two vertices of S have any common neighbors. Let H_t be the resulting graph. We note that the order of H_t is

$$4 + 4\left[1 + 2 + 4 + \cdots + 2^{t-1}\right] = 2^{t+2}.$$

Given a fractional domination of H_t, the total weight of the vertices in each $N[u_i]$ is at least 1. Since the sets $N[u_1]$, $N[u_2]$, $N[u_3]$, $N[u_4]$ are pairwise disjoint, we have $\gamma_f(H_t) \geq 4$. On the other hand, S dominates H_t, so $\gamma(H_t) \leq 4$. Thus,

$$4 \leq \gamma_f(H_t) \leq \gamma(H_t) \leq 4,$$

and we have $\gamma_f(H_t) = \gamma(H_t) = 4$.

If we approximate $\gamma(H_t)$ with the greedy algorithm, then we will never choose any vertex in S. The greedy dominating sequence will contain one vertex from each of the cliques used to construct H_t. Since $t \geq 4$ the first four such vertices chosen will dominate the four vertices in S, and so $\gamma_g(H_t) = t$. $\square$

Letting $n = 2^{t+2}$, and letting G_n be H_t from the above example, we obtain the following.

Corollary 11. *There exist graphs G_n, for infinitely many integers n, so that each G_n has order n, and*

$$\frac{\gamma_g(G_n)}{\gamma(G_n)} = \Theta(\log n). \quad \square$$

We now consider upper bounds on γ_g. By Theorem 4 we have, for a graph G of order n,

$$\gamma_g(G) \leq c_1 \gamma_f(G) \log n, \tag{1}$$

for some constant c_1. And by Theorem 3, we have

$$\gamma_g(G) \leq c_2 \frac{n \log \delta(G)}{\delta(G)}, \tag{2}$$

for some constant c_2.

Consider these bounds for the graph H_t from Example 10. We have $\gamma_f(H_t) = 4$, and clearly $\delta(H_t) = 4$. Thus, letting n be the order of H_t, the right-hand side of (1) is $\Theta(\log n)$, while the right-hand side of (2) is $\Theta(n)$, making (1) by far the tighter bound.

On the other hand, let t be a positive integer, and let G be a t-clique with a pendant vertex joined to each clique vertex (a "hairy clique"). Letting n be the order of G, we have $\gamma_f(G) = t = n/2$, and $\delta(G) = 1$. Thus, the right-hand side of (1) is $\Theta(n \log n)$, while the right-hand side of (2) is $\Theta(n)$, making (2) the tighter bound.

References

[1] N. Alon and J.H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, Wiley, New York, 1992.

[2] B. Bollobás and P. Erdős, Cliques in random graphs, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **80** (1976), no. 3, 419–427.

[3] H. Chernoff, A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations, *Ann. Math. Statistics* **23** (1952), no. 4, 493–507.

[4] W.E. Clark, B. Shekhtman, S. Suen, and D.C. Fisher, Upper bounds for the domination number of a graph, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-ninth Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing* (Boca Raton, FL, 1998), *Congr. Numer.* **132** (1998), 99–123.

[5] G.S. Domke, S.T. Hedetniemi, and R.C. Laskar, Fractional packings, coverings, and irredundance in graphs, in *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing* (Baton Rouge, LA, 1988), *Congr. Numer.* **66** (1988), 227–238.

[6] M.R. Garey and D.S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, Freeman, San Francisco, 1979.

[7] D.L. Grinstead and P.J. Slater, Fractional domination and fractional packing in graphs, in *Proceedings of the Twentieth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing* (Boca Raton, FL, 1989), *Congr. Numer.* **71** (1990), 153–172.

[8] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, and P.J. Slater, *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.

[9] D.S. Johnson, Approximation algorithms for combinatorial problems, *J. Comput. System Sci.* **9** (1974), 256–278.

[10] L. Lovász, On the ratio of optimal integral and fractional covers, *Discrete Math.* **13** (1975), no. 4, 383–390.

[11] S.E. Nikoletseas and P.G. Spirakis, Near-optimal dominating sets in dense random graphs in polynomial expected time, in *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, J. van Leeuwen, ed., *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **790**, Springer, Berlin, 1994, 1–10.

[12] E.M. Palmer, *Graphical Evolution: An Introduction to the Theory of Random Graphs*, Wiley, Chichester, 1985.

[13] A. Schrijver, *Combinatorial Optimization, Polyhedra and Efficiency, Vol. C: Disjoint Paths, Hypergraphs*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.

[14] K. Weber, Domination number for almost every graph, *Rostock. Math. Kolloq.* **16** (1981), 31–43.